

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response the non-final Office Action mailed on April 23, 2004. Reexamination in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are currently pending in this application, with claims 1, and 4 being independent. No new matter has been added.

I. Allowable subject matter

Appreciation is expressed for the indication that claims 4 and 5 contain allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 4 has been placed into independent form.

Allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over HAMAGISHI (5,855,425) in view of SUDO et al. (EP 0 899 969).

This rejection is traversed at least for the following reasons.

Claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon

Claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon are drawn to a multi-person shared display device, which is a display device shared by a plurality of users, comprising: a display device, which displays a plurality of images for a plurality of users on a screen; a display mask, which is disposed so as to cover said display device separated by a fixed distance and has one fixed sufficiently large hole through which each of said plurality of users watches said image corresponding to the user on said display device; a position sensor, which detects a location of the user in real space corresponding to said display device; and a processing device, which is dynamically combined with said display device and said position sensor, and displays the image corresponding to the user upon said display device in accordance with said location of the user through said position sensor.

Hamagishi arguably teaches a stereoscopic display. However, the Office Action admits that Hamagishi does not explicitly teach the display mask having “a sufficiently large hole” as claimed.” Thus, Hamagishi fails to disclose, teaches or suggest “sufficiently large hole.” The Office Action cites SUDO for the features deficient within Hamagishi.

In addition, Hamagishi’s system uses the parallax barrier which has slits (see column 7, lines 20-22), in order to display, through the respective slit, not more than one pixel (see column 7, line 66 to column 8, line 35) on the dispersion panel 2 for two or more viewers. (The information corresponding to not more than one pixel is supplied to one separating function portion in the parallax barrier 2c’.) Thus, the slit of Hamagishi does not correspond to “sufficiently large hole” according to the present invention.

SUDO arguably teaches a three dimensional image reconstructing apparatus. Since SUDO arguably teaches that a pinhole 4 moves throughout the entire area of a pinhole panel 3 (Page 11, line 31), SUDO fails to disclose, teach or suggest “one fixed sufficiently large hole.” Thus, SUDO fails to disclose, teach or suggest “one fixed sufficiently large hole through which each of said plurality of users watches said image corresponding to the user on said display device.”

Furthermore, neither Hamagishi nor SUDO suggests that a person of ordinary skill in the art can combine Hamagishi’s system as claimed with the display mask with the “pinhole” since the size of the pinhole shown in SUDO is not taken into consideration in order to display the image to two or more viewers.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

III. Newly added claims

Claims 6 and 7 corresponding to previous claims 4 and 5 are newly added since claim 4 has been placed into independent form.

Dependent Claim 8 is also added in order to claim various features of the invention.

IV. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance. (original) Accordingly, favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and remarks is courteously solicited.

If any fee is required or any overpayment made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee or credit the overpayment to Deposit Account # 18-0013.

The undersigned has been given limited recognition by the Director to prosecute as an attorney this application under 37 C.F.R. §10.9(a). A copy of the document granting limited recognition under 37 C.F.R. §10.9(b) is concurrently filed for recordation purpose.

Dated: *July 22, 2004*

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Toshikatsu Imaizumi

Registration No.: Limited Recognition
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W.
Suite 501
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 955-3750
Attorney for Applicant